

A5032

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 7, 1965

represents more than 20 percent of the total vote cast in Alabama in the presidential election of 1960. Research to which I have had access and the facts I presented to the Members of the House show that the vast majority of qualified Negroes in Alabama are registered. Those who are not registered, for the most part, are ineligible because of convictions of felonies or by reason of illiteracy. To abolish literacy tests and to give the franchise to those who cannot read or write or comprehend, is to turn the government over to those who are not capable of governing. We have seen the result of this in countries where illiterates do have the vote and where there is constant turmoil and revolution.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCES AT WORK

During this past week I have made a number of statements in Congress and in the RECORD pointing out the Communist influences at work among the leadership of the demonstrations. Even such liberal writers as Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, in their column in the Washington Post, pointed out the leftwing influence of the leaders of the Selma demonstrations on Martin Luther King and in fomenting the violence which has occurred there. The President, himself, admitted to me, that Communists were active in the demonstrations, but said you cannot keep them out.

Maybe they cannot be kept out, but that is all the more reason why this President and Congress should not knuckle under to the mob rule they created.

BRIEFS OF THE WEEK

By a vote of 203 to 177 the House defeated a bill which would raise the salaries of Supreme Court Justices. I was proud to vote against it. One of the tragic parts of the President's appearance before Congress was to see the Justices of the Supreme Court applauding his demands for legislation. This is supposed to be an impartial body which must judge the constitutionality of legislation on its merits, but evidently they have already prejudged this bill.

Our current Government under the Johnson administration has been labeled the "Great Busted Society" by the nationally read columnist, Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Jones says the national debt is ignored, controlled inflation is called necessary, and the fact that every nation which has so ignored economic laws has gone busted is ignored. The last balanced budget was in the final fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration which produced a surplus of \$1.2 billion. Since then we have had deficits of \$3.8 billion, \$6.3 billion, \$6.2 billion, and \$8.2 billion.

Manpower Development and Training Act Helps Minneapolis Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 3, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a major legislative achievement of the Kennedy administration was the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, now renamed the Manpower Act. I would like to call the attention of the House to one example of the effective implementation of the Manpower Development and Training Act in my home city of Minneapolis.

The following article from the North Minneapolis Post described the success

of a program involving 10 Minneapolis young people, the Minneapolis youth development project, the Wells Memorial Settlement House, the American Bindery Co., and the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training of the Department of Labor:

BOOKBINDERS JOIN ON-THE-JOB PROGRAM

Mr. and Mrs. Saul Rusoff are the proprietors of the American Bindery Co., 310 Plymouth Avenue North. Their business is to rebind books.

The Rusoffs early this year met with the Youth Development Project staff to ascertain how they as employers could cooperate with the Government in employing and training disadvantaged youth.

The YDP through its youth employment coordinator, Edgar Pillow, contacted the bureau of apprenticeship training, D. W. Holen, and together with Bruce McBeath, youth program director at Wells Memorial Settlement House, 1120 Oliver Avenue North, developed an on-the-job training and counseling program for 10 disadvantaged youth, ages 18 to 21.

Under this program, the employer pays the wages of the 10 youths and then the Federal Government reimburses the employer for the costs of supervision and instruction on the job. This relieves an employer of the sometimes additional expenses incurred in training beginning employees. The program is helpful to employers with moderate size firms who cannot afford to institute training programs of their own, and it is especially helpful in providing employment and training opportunities for unskilled youth with potential.

In proportion to the industry that is present in Minneapolis, there have been very few on-the-job training programs instituted for youth, and particularly for disadvantaged youth. Past experience has indicated that on-the-job training when conducted by an employer or an industry far surpasses other means of training. The youth becomes acquainted with actual work experience and current skill training, in addition to learning the attitudes that an employer expects of an employee on the job.

The Rusoffs also hire many college youth during the summer enabling them to continue to finance their education. The Rusoff's hiring of disadvantaged youth is not a new experience for them. They have been doing it for several years out of a sense of social responsibility to help all youth. This is the first year the Rusoffs have received any financial assistance to help them in their work with disadvantaged youth.

The 10 youths that participated in the on-the-job training program at the American Bindery Co. were a composite group. Some were high school graduates, some were dropouts; some were males and some were females. The most common characteristics possessed by the youths were their lack of skills and previous successful work experiences. A genuine wish and need that all of them had was for a job.

Because of the lack of previous successes in their lives many of the youth were somewhat defensive and tense when the program began. In recognition of this probability, Wells Memorial Settlement House under their "Project Employment" program provided ongoing counseling to the youth in combination with the employer.

The Rusoffs, because of their experience in employing and working with youth of varying abilities and attitudes, were especially helpful in teaching skills and providing the realistic vocational counseling that can only take place on an actual job.

An indicative example: One of the youths, long unemployed and with a 9th grade education, was afraid to begin training on the machinery at the bindery. The proprietor gradually worked the youth over to a less advanced machine and taught him how to

use an ordinary ruler to obtain simple mathematical calibrations needed for the operation of the machine. There are other examples that could be cited where frustration and fear of failure on the part of the youth have changed to confidence and productivity.

As the 5 week on-the-job training program is about to terminate, some of the achievements that can be cited are that 9 of the 10 youths that were employed by the Rusoffs are still with them; that three of the dropouts have indicated to the proprietor they intend to return to school this September and have asked and received the promise of 10 hours employment weekly while going to school; all of the youths who complete the program will receive a personal letter of recommendation as to their achievement from the proprietor; and finally the youth themselves, because of this responsible and successful work and training experience have something marketable to offer to their future employers.

Party Politics in Vietnam War Deplored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer is more than a newspaper; it is a fine old institution.

That newspaper's statesmanlike voice and its refreshing frankness were raised recently in comment on the attempt by some Republican Members of this body to place the responsibility for the war in Vietnam upon the Democratic Party and the Johnson administration.

This was the comment of the News and Observer: "The attempt is ridiculous on its face."

Mr. Speaker, I deplore this action by the House Republicans and I offer this excellent editorial, "More of the Same," for entry in the RECORD.

The editorial, which appeared August 26, follows:

MORE OF THE SAME

The attempt by House Republicans in the Congress to blame the war in Vietnam on the Democratic Party is ridiculous on its face. And it is surely made more ridiculous because the same Republicans are pressing for an expansion of the same war.

Republicans have long been fond of arguing that every major war which this country has fought in the last 75 years was initiated and fought when Democrats occupied the White House. This latest move to pin a partisan label on war seems hardly more than more of the same.

If any kind of generalization can be made about the differences between the two political parties when faced with a military crisis, it is that Republicans nearly always insist on a more militant, hard line posture. The reason they do is because such "toughness" is thought consistent with a whole cluster of conservative notions.

Barry Goldwater indulged this idea more than any other respected political figure in recent years. During the last presidential campaign he was joking—but speaking a "truth" his audience understood, nonetheless—when he said he would like to lob a couple of nuclear bombs into the men's room of the Kremlin.

September 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5031

California to New England were heard to comment with amazement, "and they won't take a penny." Class funds, as well as donations from local merchants, provided the supplies.

The generosity of the seniors from the Conneaut High School and their concern for their fellowman speaks highly of the fine people who live in the city of Conneaut. Conneaut is known as the gateway to the State of Ohio due to its strategic location in the northeastern corner of our State and with such thoughtful and industrious teenagers the future of Conneaut is indeed a bright one.

Mr. Speaker, I felt I must point out to my colleagues this action by a group of teenagers. It is time we pay them the compliment of recognizing their outstanding and valuable services to their community instead of downgrading them as a group for the careless and irresponsible action of a few.

I am proud that Conneaut, Ohio, is in the 11th Congressional District.

Miss Henrietta Mace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there are few people who are so close to the heartbeat of the people as welfare directors. A thousand problems are brought to them every day. Calmly, efficiently, quietly, these directors chart new courses for people in difficulty, alleviate pain, provide housing for those in need, care for children, ease the last days of the elderly.

I feel honored to pay tribute to the Nation's county welfare officers in including the following story from the *Havre de Grace Record* in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a well-merited tribute to Miss Henrietta Mace who has been the Director of Public Welfare for Harford County, Md., for the past 19 years. Along with every citizen of Harford County and of the State of Maryland, I wish her golden years to come.

The article follows:

[From the *Havre-de Grace Record*]

MISS HENRIETTA MACE

Miss Henrietta Frazier Mace, director, Harford County Welfare Board, has announced that she will resign August 31, 1965. Tonight, she will be honored at a dinner attended by friends and associates of Harford County and the State of Maryland.

Miss Mace became director of Harford County Welfare Board in 1946 and has witnessed many changes in social thought and practice during her 19 years in Harford County. She started her social work career when she worked in the outpatient clinic at Delaware Hospital in Wilmington, Del. In the late 1920's, she returned to Baltimore County, where she did voluntary social work. She began working as a caseworker for Baltimore County Welfare Department on March 1, 1934. Later she was on the staff

of Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore City.

Miss Mace was graduated from the Friends School in Wilmington. She studied at Johns Hopkins University and graduated from University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work in 1945. Miss Mace is an active member of the National Association of Social Workers and is an accredited certified social worker. She is also a member of the International Association of Social Workers and the Soroptimist Club of Bel Air.

PET PROJECT

One of Miss Mace's many pet projects is the welfare department's children's services, which started at the beginning of her administration. At that time there were less than two dozen children in care. In July 1965, there were 165 children in this program. During this time the adoption program was started and each year there has been an increasing number of children permanently placed for adoption.

Efficiency and minimum cost of operation can be noted during Miss Mace's administration. Harford County continues to hold the middle position of the 24 Maryland counties in their net expenditures for public assistance and administration. Although population in Harford County has more than doubled during Miss Mace's administration, the net cost of the welfare program has shown substantially less increase, compared to other counties with expanding population.

When Miss Mace became director, the total number of persons receiving assistance was 316 for an average month. Those administering the program were the director, four caseworkers, and two clerks. The number of caseworkers increased to 11, with Miss Mace as both director and supervisor, until 1961, when a supervisor was added to the staff. In an average month during 1965, the caseload has been approximately 601 cases (old-age assistance, aid to families of dependent children, aid to permanently and totally disabled, and general public assistance).

In addition, 509 persons receive medical assistance to the aged. There are over 903 children being supervised under foster care and aid to families with dependent children by the Harford welfare during a typical month. The present staff includes the director, 3 supervisors, 16 caseworkers, and 7 clerical staff.

SERVED ON MANY BOARDS

In addition to numerous agency responsibilities, Miss Mace has served on many local boards. She helped start the school for the retarded. Also, she served on a committee of three persons to initiate the Harford County Council of Social Agencies. Recently, she worked with legislators to establish the Citizens Nursing Home, which is under construction here. Miss Mace has also served on the following boards: TB, Mental Health Society, economic opportunity program, including the Community Action Program, civil defense, and Committee for Aged. For the past 5 years, she has served on a board which sets up regional meetings in Harford and Cecil Counties for social workers and has been an active member of the Maryland State Conference of Social Work Board.

MUCH TRAVELED

One of Miss Mace's special interests is traveling. She has used annual leave to visit in South America, Mexico, Caribbean, and Bermuda, as well as numerous trips through the Eastern States. After retirement, she plans to continue these trips and would like to go to Europe, Hawaii, Alaska, and distant States in the United States. Miss Mace also plans to pursue her hobbies in copper, pewter, and silverwork and ceramic design, and she might get time to catch up on some of the books she has been saving for this time.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my Washington Report, my weekly newsletter to my constituents, of March 25, 1965:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JIM MARTIN, Seventh District, Alabama)

THE ASSAULT UPON THE SOUTH

The massive assault upon the South, and in particular upon Alabama, was continued in Congress last week. It began with the Monday night address by the President to a joint session of Congress. Never before has a Chief Executive of the United States made such a concerted attack upon a sovereign State, its elected officials, and its people. The whole effort was designed to get enactment of the President's voting rights bill.

The President's demand that Congress pass his bill at once and without changing a line, was clearly out of order. Under the Constitution the Congress is the legislative body. The President is to administer the laws of the land and the functions of Government. He cannot demand or force Congress to pass certain bills and he has no right, under the Constitution, to demand that Congress take bills prepared by him without adequate study and debate.

If Congress is stampeded into passing legislation because the President is subject to pressure by street mobs, we will have taken a long step toward dictatorship.

The President's voting rights bill, H.R. 6400, is wrong. It is unconstitutional. It is not a bill to insure the rights of all citizens to vote. It is directed against six Southern States. Under the President's bill, these Southern States may not deny the right to vote to illiterates, felons or anyone for any reason, but other States may. This startling admission was made by Attorney General Katzenbach in the first day's hearings before the House Judiciary Committee. Hearings, incidentally, which were started before Members of Congress could even get a copy of the bill.

To legislate in such an atmosphere of hysteria is irresponsible and without precedent. I am opposed to the President's bill. I have been working on a countermeasure with leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. My suggested bill would remove any existing injustices in the application of voting laws, but it would protect the rights of the States to exercise their constitutional authority to determine voter qualifications.

ALABAMA DELEGATION DEFENDS OUR STATE

On Wednesday the entire Alabama delegation in the House took the floor in defense of our State and our people to answer some of the charges made by the President. I was more proud than ever on that day to be an Alabamian and a southerner.

In my own remarks I made an effort to present facts on voter registration of Negroes in Alabama to refute the President's televised statement that "the only way to break the barriers in the South is to have a white skin." Even the Washington Evening Star in a strong editorial pointed out that that statement by the President "was not a fact."

The fact is that 115,000 Negroes are registered and voting in Alabama. This figure

September 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5033

Of course, most Republicans do not want this country in a war. But many do believe that as an instrument of foreign policy, our bombs and rockets should be rattled more loudly. And if Communists don't show proper respect for our military might, we should more quickly demonstrate it.

Presumably this is why congressional Republicans are pressing for a greater military commitment in Vietnam. Even without questioning their oversimplified judgment on that point, it should be obvious that the Vietnam war is not a "Democratic Party war."

Mr. Speaker, the New York Post, also on August 26, discussed this matter lucidly and forcefully in an editorial entitled, "The GOP Hunts for an Issue." I offer this brief but interesting editorial for the RECORD, and I hope that my colleagues of both parties will find it enlightening.

[From the New York Post, Aug. 26, 1965]

THE GOP HUNTS FOR AN ISSUE

The white paper on Vietnam issued by House Republicans without the blessings of either General Eisenhower or Senator DIRKSEN is a sad little performance.

There is no passion evident in it either for peace or war—only for partisanship.

Can anyone, after reading the white paper, say clearly what its authors are after in Vietnam, except to score a few political points?

Our military involvement in Vietnam, they say plaintively, is not a consequence of President Eisenhower's commitment. Does that mean they are against it? Hardly, since they also call for total victory, although they are not willing to demand a military escalation commensurate with such an objective.

The document is a jumble of shreds and patches whose political purpose is clear.

The authors are trying to revive the formula that served the GOP so well in 1952 when it simultaneously denounced the Democrats for "Truman's war" and for failing to stand up to the Communists.

Dream on, fellows, if you think this is a winning issue in 1966.

Bridging With a Flair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read the perceptive editorial of the Baltimore Sun on President Johnson's appointment of John Gronouski as Ambassador to Poland. Mr. Gronouski has had a distinguished career as a public servant. His present assignment is one which requires the abilities which he possesses and makes felicitous use of his Polish origins. It is my pleasure to include this editorial from the Sun of August 31, 1965 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 31, 1965]

BRIDGING WITH A FLAIR

President Lyndon Johnson has raised the ratio of career ambassadors to political ones from 2 to 1 to 3 to 1 in the past 2 years. This has been good for State Department morale and good for the Nation's interests overseas. It has also tended to overshadow the care and imagination the President has used in selecting noncareerists.

On Sunday the President named Postmaster General John Gronouski to be Ambassador to Poland, an appointment that is an excellent example of imagination and care.

Mr. Gronouski is a highly esteemed public servant. He has been adequate in his present job, one in which "adequate" is an adjective of high praise. He has been a teacher of economics and banking and the tax commissioner in his native Wisconsin, earning praise and respect. This record and his interest in international finance are recommendations enough for his new job. But there is more.

He is the grandson of a Polish immigrant, a director of the Pulaski Foundation, a speaker of the language.

Last year the President promised to build bridges to eastern Europe. To be precise, what is needed is bridge rebuilding, certainly in the case of Poland. As the President said Sunday, part of Mr. Gronouski's job is to strengthen the "deep and historic bond" between the two countries.

The choice of a Polish-American whose rose to the top in this country as a public servant is bridge rebuilding with a flair.

Federalist Meeting in San Francisco Calls for Stronger United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 3, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the U.N. General Assembly meeting in San Francisco last June, the World Association of World Federalists also met in that city. The 1,000 delegates from 31 countries discussed vital steps needed for strengthening the United Nations.

I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an excellent report from the August 11 issue of Christian Century, written by Howard Y. Williams, field director for the United World Federalists, Minnesota branch:

WORLD FEDERALISTS VIEW THE U.N.

More than 1,000 delegates from 31 countries came to San Francisco June 20-26 (the week of the United Nations' 20th anniversary celebration) to attend the 12th Congress of the World Association of World Federalists—held concurrently with the 10th Assembly of United World Federalists, which implements the world movement in the United States. Japan, with 100 representatives, had the largest delegation from abroad.

Among the world leaders who participated in the sessions were two ambassadors to the United Nations: Chief S. O. Adebore, of Nigeria, and H. E. Rossides, of Cyprus; President Carlos P. Romulo, of the University of the Philippines, a former president of the U.N. General Assembly; Luis Quintanilla, who formerly represented Mexico in that Assembly; Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, of Pakistan, a member of the International Court of Justice; and Hideki Yukawa, of Japan, a Nobel prize winner (in physics).

Discussion centered on three major freedoms all agreed must be achieved through the U.N. in the next 20 years: freedom from war, freedom from want, and freedom from diversity. Consensus was reached on the following goals that must be achieved if those freedoms are to be realized: complete and enforced disarmament in all nations through carefully controlled stages,

a permanent U.N. peace force and an effective inspection system, revision of the General Assembly so it will have power to adopt binding rules and regulations, revision of the Security Council to change its voting system and make it responsible to the General Assembly, strengthening of the International Court of Justice, initiation of a world development program involving the spending of \$70 billion annually instead of the present \$8 billion, adoption of a reliable and adequate revenue system to support a strengthened U.N., clear reservation to the member states and their people of all powers not granted to the U.N., extension to all nations of eligibility for membership in the U.N.

Since most of these changes would require revision of the U.N. Charter, the delegates declared that a conference for revision of that document must be called at the earliest possible date. They agreed that unless the outmoded charter is altered to give the world body the power it needs to deal with the modern world, a third world war is inevitable. Speaker after speaker held that if the aims of peace are to be realized there must be a revolution in men's minds, a higher standard for human relationships. Said Chief Adebore, "The old slogan, 'If you want peace, you must prepare for war,' is nonsense. We must declare, 'If you want peace you must prepare for peace.'" On all sides one heard the assertion that today it takes more than courage to fight for peace than to fight in war.

Delegates recorded their conviction that the door to peace is now open as never before, that nothing less than enforceable world law can succeed, that only a strengthened U.N. can keep the human race from committing suicide. Luis Quintanilla suggested that the atom bomb deserves the Nobel peace prize for having spurred mankind's efforts toward realization of a warless world.

President Robert Buron of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's center in Paris stressed the need to mobilize youth for peace, pointing out that young people's response to the Peace Corps demonstrates their readiness to go anywhere in the world where help is needed.

The delegates were obviously disappointed in President Lyndon Johnson's address at the U.N. anniversary program late in the week; they had hoped to hear a more dramatic appeal for measures to achieve peace. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, however, reminded participants in the Congress that President Johnson's speech did contain some constructive elements: an invitation to the U.N. to move into the Vietnam situation; support for a U.N. peacekeeping force; an appeal for arms control; stress on the need for a worldwide war on poverty, disease, and illiteracy; the declaration that \$5 spent on birth control is worth more than \$100 spent on economic development; and a call to give reality to the U.N. Charter.

Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, was elected president of the world body, whose next congress will be held in Oslo, Norway, in 1967. C. Maxwell Stanley, a businessman from Muscatine, Iowa, was elected to a second term as president of United World Federalists.

HOWARD Y. WILLIAMS.

A Vacation for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker we have just reached the first week in September.

A5034

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 7, 1965

It has been a long time since we adjourned prior to this time of year. This year is obviously no different.

The following editorial, broadcast over the McLendon Corp. radio stations in Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, San Francisco, Chicago, and Buffalo on August 25, 1965, suggests a reasonable and rational solution to Washington's heat:

VACATION FOR CONGRESS

(An editorial by the Old Scotchman, Gordon McLendon, president of the McLendon stations.)

We must agree wholeheartedly with those who propose a set annual vacation for Congress. Many national regulatory agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission, regularly adjourn for 1 month during the summer.

Congress should also adjourn from August 1 until after Labor Day—a period during which Washington's heat is at its worst. Congressional work is taxing and demands the most alert minds. Yet, after months in session, an overtired Congress which is beset by Washington's stifling summer heat postpones legislation demanding real thought.

Congress is a year-round job now. Members of Congress must, in the best interest of this Nation, have a vacation preferably in the worst summer months in Washington, and at a time when school is out and they can take their families on vacation. Such a vacation period for Congress from August 1 until after Labor Day is only good sense.

After Watts, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 25, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record a most thoughtful editorial from the August 27, 1965, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune concerning the tragedy in Watts, Calif.

The editorial follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Aug. 27, 1965]

AFTER WATTS, WHAT?

In the Watts section of the city of Los Angeles, the guns are silent, the ashes are cold, the troops are gone from the streets. The searing, wrenching, terrifying riot is over, put down by force as it had to be.

The question for Watts, for Los Angeles—yes, and for South Bend and every urban community in the North—now is: What next?

Do we hire more policemen and keep our National Guards on alert and hope neither will be needed? Do we wrangle irrelevantly about police brutality and mistake a symptom for a root problem?

Or do we face up at last to the existence, in the midst of but alien from middleclass manners and morals and attitudes (but very much in tune with middleclass aspirations), of a jobless, often hopeless hate-filled, primarily colored minority all too ready to resort to what has been called "the violence of despair?"

This minority is characterized by a matriarchal family pattern in which the husband and father is usually out of work and frequently out of sight, in which almost a quarter of the children are born out of wedlock and most grow up with little or no

discipline, in which youngsters find no incentive at home to learn or to succeed, in which "whitey" is the symbol of their despair, but only because "whitey" is as easily identifiable to them as they are to him.

What has to be done? First of all, channels of communication with this minority must be improved, or in some cases established. Job training and then job opportunity must be furnished to adults, special assistance and motivation must be provided to children in school and younger.

Escape from the ghetto must be possible for those who are willing to work their way out.

None of these things will be done easily or quickly. Even those communities in which they are undertaken may be asked to show great patience in the next generation or two as further outbreaks of violence boil up from the despair.

But unless the effort is made, the very fabric of society will be threatened. That's how serious the problem is.

Resource Development Discussed by
Elmer Staats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, early this summer the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, appeared before the 52d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to deliver informal remarks on the status of the development of America's natural resources.

This status report, which gathers together programs of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and all other agencies which participate in development of natural resources, provides a good view of the efforts being made in this direction by the Federal Government. Few officials in Government are in a better position to comment on this broad field than Mr. Staats, one of our ablest public officials.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have these remarks by Mr. Staats printed in the Record at this time:

"THE NATURAL RESOURCES BUDGET," INFORMAL REMARKS BY HON. ELMER B. STAATS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry to be late. I almost thought for a moment that I had come too early when I heard Floyd Dominy use that word "deep freeze," because I thought he was going to talk about me.

It's a pleasure to have a chance to come and meet with this group. I'm afraid I won't be able to give you quite the oration that Floyd has given you because I've been so busy wrestling around with his projects, I haven't had a chance to write such a speech. But seriously, I would like to give you a little bit of a status report, I might call it, rather than a formal address, as to where it seems to me we have made some significant advances, since we had our last meeting with you a year ago.

And I'd like first to remind you that with

respect to expenditures in the budget as a whole for natural resources programs—and in this, as you know, we include all of the resource agencies—this growth has been a very phenomenal growth. There has been an increase from \$1.7 billion in 1960 to an estimated \$2.7 billion in 1965. Roughly this is about a 60 percent increase, or more than twice as fast a growth as has taken place in the budget as a whole for the Federal Government. I think this is a very important fact.

The increase in expenditures in recent years indicates the importance of conservation and development of natural resources to the Nation's economic growth, and the extent of Federal support for natural resources activities despite the restrictive budgetary policy that we have had to follow. There are many things in the budget that we would like to do more of, and that particularly applies to the area of natural resources development.

Reference has been made to the fact that last year was a conservation Congress, and I dare say that this year will also be a conservation Congress, because of the great attention and time and interest in new legislation which the Congress enacted last year, and I'm sure will again this year.

Now the 1966 budget recommended funds for the Corps of Engineers to start construction on 37 new projects with an estimated total Federal cost of \$777 million. Development since January has resulted in shifting four of these proposed starts to the fiscal year 1965, and adding one more proposed project for fiscal 1966. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is expected to undertake 19 new planning starts.

The 1966 budget provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to start five new water resource projects, involving a total Federal cost of \$103 million. It also provides loans for four small reclamation projects, and in addition, three new planning starts. For the TVA, the budget provided for one large steam power plant to be started in 1966, involving an estimated cost of \$150 million, and in addition, four new water resource projects were recommended for starting involving a Federal cost of \$48 million.

In addition to the projects being initiated by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the TVA, the budget recommended funds for the Department of Agriculture to assist local units of government in starting construction of 70 new watershed protection projects in 1966. Since the budget was presented to the Congress, funds have been recommended and appropriated to finance the Appalachian program in the 1965 and 1966 period. Funds provided include 10 additional watershed projects in the Appalachia region.

Now I'd like to mention just briefly where we stand with respect to the current 1965 rivers and harbors bill. Since 1962, when the last omnibus bill was enacted, the Bureau of the Budget has reviewed and has completed its clearance action on 105 project authorization reports. Of these, 60 have been cleared since January of this year, so you can see we've been pretty busy over in the Bureau. As of today we're fairly current. Only seven final project reports for the Corps of Engineers are pending in the Bureau of the Budget as of today. In addition, we have 40 advance reports, but final project reports have not yet been received in the Bureau. The reports cleared by the Bureau of the Budget as of today involve an estimated total Federal cost of a billion and a half dollars.

Many of you are interested. I know, in the status of the basin monetary authorizations. The budget recommendations for the Corps of Engineers for 1966 included funds to advance developments on various comprehensive river basin projects which are subject to monetary authorization ceilings. A

September 7, 1965

find a meager supper for himself and his family.

This was the sad picture which Mr. Iglesias-Pantín described before Special Commissioner Henry K. Carroll, appointed by President McKinley to study conditions prevalent in the newly acquired territory of Puerto Rico.

But there was hope, too.

Our chief object—

Mr. Iglesias declared—

has been to obtain for each of the guild members the greatest amount of education possible. * * * Under the new (American) institutions, we shall find this much easier, because we understand that in the United States the greatest part of the forces of the Government are directed to the propagation of instruction for its workmen.

We also will have to direct our attention—

He added—

especially to the economic aspect of our trade, as that has been at a very low ebb.

True enough, some years later, as a member of the Senate in the Legislature of Puerto Rico, he was able to sponsor legislation to improve working conditions in the island and to protect the workers' right to organize unions and enter into collective agreements.

As a politician, Mr. Iglesias-Pantín was astute and shrewd. He founded the Socialist Party, which gradually drew strength from the fast-growing unions, and was elected a Senator when Congress gave the island a new Organic Act in 1917.

He was for some years the only representative of his party in the legislature, and the anecdote went round that whenever an important situation came up he would close his eyes and hold his head with both hands, elbows firm against the flat top of his desk.

"Sh, sh," he would answer to anyone interrupting his meditation, "I'm holding a party caucus."

His task as Resident Commissioner was difficult, but somehow he was able to overcome formidable obstacles to reach his goals. When Mr. Iglesias died, he earned praise from all those colleagues who had been fortunate to be his friends.

I always found him concerned only for the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico, and never for himself—

Said delegate Dimond, of Alaska, adding:

Nobody who knew him can truthfully deny that while he was Commissioner from Puerto Rico, the people of that island had an able, high-minded and devoted advocate in the Congress.

Even a man as reticent as Adm. William D. Leahy, then Governor of Puerto Rico, said:

His death is a great loss. He was a true public servant, loyal to the legions who honored him.

I should like to bring memory in the House of Representatives today, of this former colleague who devoted himself so

untiringly to the cause of labor, to the laborer's uplift in dignity, and who gave his best effort for the betterment of Puerto Rico in general.

CBS REPORT ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, last night I watched for an hour a CBS report on the war in Vietnam. Liberally sprinkled through the report were comments by American servicemen about the significance of the battle they are fighting and the difficulty the American people seem to be having in understanding the significance and the importance of the American presence and activity in Vietnam. Occasionally a soldier suggested rather hopefully that the voices of withdrawal were a distinct minority.

Debate of American policy is a healthy characteristic of our form of government. This debate is valuable, however, only as it is predicated upon accurate information. Recently the White House, in cooperation with the Departments of State and Defense issued a publication entitled "Why Vietnam." This booklet performs two useful services. It spells out clearly the background of our commitment in South Vietnam and contains excellent factual statements both by Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara.

I am advised that the demand for copies of this publication from Members of Congress has been heavy and the supply is limited. I am further advised that the cost of publication as a House document is very substantially less than if additional copies were to be printed for congressional use by the State Department. In view of the congressional demand and the savings to be expected, I think it proper for the House to reprint this publication as a House document.

PRESS AGENT, BUT STILL PRESIDENT

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as anyone knows, who has read the Constitution, the President of the United States also serves as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but a great many eyebrows are being raised over the President's apparent assumption of the additional role of "editor in chief" of the Nation's newspapers.

In the summer issue of the Columbia Journalism Review, published under the auspices of the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University, is a most enlightening article entitled "Press Agent, but Still President." It deserves to be read by every member of the fourth estate faced with the problem of choosing between respect for his readers and respect for the Presidency.

To indicate how closely this article describes the present situation, the Wash-

ington Post this morning contains an article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak entitled "The Planned Press Conference." This article penetrates the image of Presidential press conferences and portrays them for what they are—planned propaganda.

I commend both articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Columbia Journalism Review, 1965]

PRESS AGENT, BUT STILL PRESIDENT (By Ben H. Bagdikian)

For a time during World War II this writer was an instructor in aerial navigation, an exercise that required one student navigator to direct the plane to a practice target while a second navigator, in the same plane but out of touch with the first, tracked where the plane had been and where it was headed. One night the first navigator said the plane would hit the target at 11 p.m. and the target would be El Paso. Asked where we would be at 11, the second navigator wrote, "Albuquerque." At 11 o'clock a large city loomed out of the night. Both men looked jubilant. On the ground I had to tell the second man we were not in Albuquerque but in El Paso. He was stunned. He pulled out his log, full of statistics like compass headings and celestial fixes, waved it in front of my face and cried, "But that's impossible. I've got the figures to prove we're in Albuquerque." He did have the figures to prove it. But the sign on the tower said El Paso and all the natives claimed to be Texans.

This episode came to mind when the President in his June 1 press conference described the care with which he decided to send the Marines to Santo Domingo: "I had 237 individual conversations during that period and about 35 meetings with various people."

The President is a lover of statistics and of appearances and in the fierce gamesmanship that has developed in the White House he has proved himself an indefatigable practitioner of the art of public relations. This has presented special problems for the press corps, but not simply because a President tries to put himself in the best light, because all do that. It has dawned only recently on Washington correspondents just how deeply committed the President is to his public relations practice.

Joseph Kraft, writing in Harper's, believes the President's troubles with the press "stem largely from the inability of the press to see the President as just another flack."

What happens if the press has to view the President of the United States as "just another flack"?

The problem is not the existence of public relations in the White House, which has to consider its "image" if for no other reason than to know whether it is being understood. But there is flackery and flackery and the White House has pushed the techniques of PR to the point of negative returns.

Some White House deceptions are forgiven as part of the job. President Eisenhower would have been wiser to refuse comment on the U-2 shot down over Russia. As a national leader the President has to keep himself open to negotiations for the national good and if he publicly associates himself with all the dirty tricks that go on behind the scenes he damages his power—not because he tells the other side anything it doesn't privately know, but because he becomes a public symbol of the dirty tricks with whom other national leaders cannot negotiate. Precisely because the President is more than a promoter of his own program and reputation, more than proprietor of Government agencies, but also a symbol of national aims and values, it is important that

¹ Henry K. Carroll, "Report on the Island of Puerto Rico," submitted to Hon. William McKinley, President of the United States, Oct. 6, 1899. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1899.

he be listened to—and speak—as something more than a shrewd public relations man.

Some of the deceptions have been important. For weeks President Johnson told the public it was being misled by reporters who said the Government was considering widening the war in Vietnam. The reporters were correct and the President wrong. The White House has implied that it consulted the Organization of American States before committing troops to the Dominican Republic, but it never told the OAS beforehand that it was considering troops.

Other illusions are of interest chiefly within the trade, such as the time the President gave a backgrounder in Texas but asked correspondents to put on a Washington date-line (which most did).

The problem is partly the astonishing portion of presidential attention given to public relations. No President has monitored his public image with more zeal. He often pulls popularity poll results out of his pocket. He adds up hours of time given to the press and it is enormous, though much of it is ritualistic or nonuseful. In one extended session a French correspondent whispered to an American that he had a Paris deadline coming up and had to leave. The President was holding forth on the White House south balcony. The American whispered back that the Frenchman couldn't possibly leave. "But we've been here for an hour and a half and he is saying nothing and I have a deadline." The American hissed, "Would you leave if Charles de Gaulle were doing this?" The Frenchman stiffened and whispered, "Charles de Gaulle would not spend 15 minutes talking about the rust on his balcony."

The President and his staff seem to ring like burglar alarms whenever and wherever the name "Johnson" appears in print or is uttered on the air. A small item in a west Texas paper mentioned Billie Sol Estes in connection with the President in a three-paragraph story on the inside; the editor claims he got a telephone call from the White House in time to kill the item in later editions. One television correspondent was awakened in the middle of the night by the White House, which had heard that he planned to make some critical remarks the next day. A newspaper correspondent wrote a critical morning story and got three telephone calls from White House aids before breakfast. The New York Review of Books, a medium-highbrow publication, ran a scathing review of Johnson's Vietnam policy and its editors got a phone call from a White House aid suggesting that in the future they have Vietnam books reviewed by Joseph Alsop (who approves of the Johnson policy).

The President has three television sets for simultaneous viewing of the three networks, plus an AP and UPI ticker. Apparently he watches them more closely than some of the editors. One night a startled wire service editor in Washington got a White House call later preserved in the house organ, UPI Reporter, as follows:

"Hello?"

"Hello, Pat, this is Lyndon Johnson."

"Yes, Mr. President."

"Say, I have here (pause) AIOIN from Johnson City, Tex., about the homestead, by Kyle Thompson. Let's see (pause) you say in there that there's going to be a fee for the tour. Well, that's not right at all. The idea is to give it to the people."

"Just a minute, Mr. President, and I'll get the story."

"You see what it says. It says 'the home was opened to the public for fee tours.' That isn't right. You see, it's for free. That's the idea. Do you see that?"

"Yes, Mr. President. It looks like they dropped the 'r' in the word 'free.' I guess they omitted it in transmission."

"Well, Pat, it sure does mean just the opposite of what we mean."

"It sure does, Mr. President, I'll fix it."

"Well, we want it to be free."

"Certainly, Mr. President. I'll straighten it out right away."

"I'd appreciate it if you would clean this up for me."

"I certainly will, Mr. President."

"We hope you will take the necessary steps to straighten this out."

"Yes, sir, Mr. President."

"Thank you, Pat."

"Thank you for letting us know, Mr. President."

But the problem is not just quantity of Presidential time and intervention. Some of it is less meticulous than his editing of UPI typos and some of it has such an implausible ending that it can only harm his credibility. He likes to be the miracle worker, so takes pains to knock down stories predicting what he will do. In December he complained that the Washington Evening Star reported falsely that he would propose a 3-percent pay raise for Federal workers. The Star dutifully reported the Presidential complaint. Then the President proposed a 3-percent pay raise for Federal workers.

At about the same time, the President complained that the Washington Post falsely reported that he planned to ask for a \$4 billion cut in excise taxes. "The President is described as feeling that the \$4 billion figure couldn't be further wrong," the news story said. The then press secretary, George Reedy, said, "That figure bears no relationship to any decision that has been made." The President proposed an excise tax cut of \$3,964 million which bears a relationship to \$4 billion as 99.1 to 100.

Nor is it unknown that a responsible White House aid will confirm a reporter's story before it is printed, and after the published story causes unexpected embarrassment another equally responsible White House aid will tell reporters that the story is wrong and was never checked with the White House.

While doing this, the President maintains sympathetic relations with editors and publishers beyond anything known before. Lyndon Johnson is the only Democratic President in this century who seems to be on better terms with newspaper publishers than with the working press. This isn't bad; it is merely astonishing. I. F. Stone, an incorrigible heretic in a town with increasing pressures for journalistic orthodoxy, has written, "Johnson sometimes seems to think the Constitution made him not only commander-in-chief of the Nation's Armed Forces but editor-in-chief of its newspapers."

Among the institutional casualties of this crushing program of public relations are the press briefings by the press secretary, which have decreasing content, and the Presidential press conference, which becomes increasingly rhetorical. Even the semi-confidential backgrounder has often been reduced to an absurdity. On April 7, for example, such a session was held to give prior interpretation of the President's Johns Hopkins University speech offering unconditional discussions on Vietnam. The briefing was given in the White House by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, then-Acting Secretary of State George Ball, and Special assistant McGeorge Bundy. Ordinarily it is not cricket to print names of briefing officers but in this case the White House disclosed them by staging a make-believe start of the briefing for television and radio for the 6 p.m. newscasts to help build public interest in the speech.

When it came to the nonattributable question and answer, the cameras were shut off but the same spirit of charade continued to pervade the session. Max Frankel, of the New York Times, asked why the Government had waited so long to make public its aims and its basis for settlement in Vietnam. Secretary Ball said that there was no delay, that the Government had always had the position presented in the President's speech. "are you saying," Frankel asked, "that this speech is not news, that we should treat it

as old stuff?" Ball replied that the Government had always held the same position, though the "formulations" might be new and, he added as a parting shot, "it may be a little clearer to you." To which John Scall, ABC diplomatic correspondent, rose to say, "Since this has all been said before, would the Secretary please refresh the reporters' memories on the last time anyone in the Government offered unconditional discussions on Vietnam?" There was general laughter and no answer.

The White House seems so obsessed with keeping the news record favorable that it is defensive about first-hand journalism that it could find useful. The press helped dispel some of the wild confusion within government on the Dominican coup d'etat with reporting from the scene that was better than official diplomatic and military reporting.

The same was true in Vietnam. John Mecklin, chief information officer in Saigon during the time when David Halberstam of the Times and Malcolm Browne of the AP were official dirty words, writes in his book, "Mission in Torment," that Halberstam and Browne were essentially correct in their reporting and the Government essentially wrong.

The White House obsession with PR would be easier to handle if it came from another source. Most correspondents learned to cope with flackdom a long time ago; they react when special pleaders originate news; they recognize the implausibly rosy release; they instinctively check with the opposition; they treat with contempt a man who deliberately film-flams them.

What is special here is Kraft's observation: most reporters have trouble looking at the President as just another flack. He is not just another flack. He is a PR man in his obsession with image, his unrestrained attempts to create illusion for tactical reasons and his concern with appearances no matter how implausible. But he is also President of the United States, carrying the burdens of his office seriously.

The problem is that Lyndon Johnson appeals to reporters with all the dignity and power of his position as President and when this does not produce the results he wants, begins manipulating them and the news in ways that are not highly regarded even at the Press Club bar. He is trying to have it both ways. The weakness of many correspondents is that the President is too valuable a source in the competition for news to be ignored as a lesser PR man would be. But deeper than that is the conflict the President creates in many serious correspondents who respect the Office of President and the man in it, but whose professional standards tell them that what is going on is common, ordinary press agency.

The President and his aids often seem to ignore the demands of professionalism upon correspondents, which require exercise of independent judgment based not on personality or pressure but on honest discrimination. Too often correspondents are asked to choose between disrespect for the reader and disrespect for the President.

One simple answer may be to report the unabashed intervention of the White House into the news process. The dialog in UPI reporter was seen widely in the trade, but it was not on the UPI wire. Ordinarily this would be healthy avoidance of narcissism. But perhaps the time has come to report the President not only as originator of news but also as editor of it.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 7, 1965]

INSIDE REPORT: THE PLANNED PRESS CONFERENCE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

If President Johnson's last nationally televised press conference from Washington on August 25 seemed a trifle bland and just a little staged, this was no accident.

September 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

22101

of vital war materials at this time was unpatriotic and might be considered by other nations as a division of support for American foreign policy.

To their credit, the negotiators were able to come to an agreement on Friday. This agreement was formally accepted by the Wage Policy Committee of the Steelworkers Union on Sunday.

We must voice our appreciation to both the steel management and labor for considering the public consequences of their private business. Their response to the urgings of the President is typical of their reactions to the public need in recent years.

The agreement itself has been termed by the President as "a fair one, designed to prevent inflation which would damage our Nation's prosperity." It is gratifying that the pact can be noninflationary. With the general business upswing crowding capacity, any major price hike in steel could bring on inflationary pressures that we could ill afford.

As we view the situation from Washington, we reflect on the impact on the economy and world politics. But to the thousands of steelworkers and their families that I represent, the steel pact means continued good times.

The small grocer in Gary knows that next week he will be cashing paychecks for his regular customers instead of filling strike orders from the business agent. The wife whose husband works in the mill knows now that she can buy the children's back-to-school clothes.

A steel strike is a very human thing—a tragedy to the people whose livelihood depends on the men in the mill.

Because their President cared enough for them, for the economy, and for the fighting men in Vietnam—the strike has been averted. He was not content to sit idly by and let a strike take its toll. He did not bring the Government into interference with the free market system. He did bring the great moral strength of his office, his own good will, and his great powers of persuasion to bear on the problem and caused its solution.

I applaud and I offer thanks to the leaders of the steel industry and to the President for their significant contribution to the American economy by their successful negotiations last week. The example of the steel leadership working with its Government to keep the wheels of industry turning is good for all businesses to see.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I assume, barring the appearance of other Senators in the Chamber, that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senate will stand in adjournment.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSALS FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on August 16 I expressed a concern that some misleading interpretations are being placed on what the United States will settle for in Vietnam. I refer Senators to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 16, 1965, pages 19782-8.

I was concerned, as I said at that time, over suggestions that we may settle for less than what the President has stated to be our minimal objectives.

I remarked that:

This is no time to give comfort to those who promote aggression. Granted that our own leaders intend to follow a firm policy, they should avoid any statements which might be construed as a sign of deviation from that policy.

It was also pointed out at that time that:

All peace-loving people are prayerful that there will be a prompt end to the war in Vietnam and that peace will come to that area. But few peace-loving people will tolerate an end to the war at the price of freedom or the profit for aggression. The national interest of the United States and South Vietnam—indeed the national interest of all nations, large and small, whose people live in freedom—repudiates a policy of peace at any price. There is a price to be paid for peace, and it is only with a clear understanding of what that price is that those who speak of "negotiations" can speak meaningfully.

President Johnson's statement at Johns Hopkins University was also repeated:

We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

All of us realize that great priority has been given by the President to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam and to bring the participants to the conference table.

But there is something of higher priority than that: It is the minimal objectives clearly stated by the President of the United States for the war in Vietnam. These objectives are: to persuade the North Vietnamese to leave their neighbor, South Vietnam, alone; to cease and desist from directing, controlling, and supplying war materiel and manpower to the Vietcong military forces in South Vietnam; and to assist the South Vietnamese in ending the attacks of the Vietcong so that the people can live in peace and freedom. This is the price of peace in Vietnam. Any cessation of hostilities and any action at the conference table must be premised on the achievement of these minimal objectives. And any timetable for cessation of hostilities and participation at the conference table cannot take priority over them.

It is with these thoughts that I turn to the statement on the floor of the Senate made by the distinguished majority leader on September 1. It has been widely reported that the views he expressed were those of the President, but whether this is so or not I do not know.

The majority leader set forth the four conditions for peace advanced by Hanoi in response to the President's Johns Hop-

kins speech. He then sought to show that these conditions might be reconcilable with President Johnson's minimal objectives.

I find it difficult to reconcile them. Hanoi's condition that the internal affairs of South Vietnam be determined by the South Vietnamese in accordance with the National Liberation Front program is repugnant to the concept of freedom for the people of South Vietnam. The peaceful, so-called reunification of all of Vietnam is a nice-sounding objective, but when one realizes the impossibility of holding genuinely free elections in a Communist dominated country, the objective lacks substance. It would seem to run counter to the only American interpretation which can be placed on President Johnson's stated objective that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision. How could there be any such international supervision without the foreign interference which Hanoi clearly demands be left out?

The distinguished majority leader also made this statement:

But unless the military conflict is to expand and to continue into the indefinite future, whether it be 3, 5, 10, or 20 years of war, the degree of these automatic reflexes must be tested in negotiations.

I do not believe that such a choice exists at all. The choice is between the realization of the minimal stated objectives of the President of the United States by negotiations and settlement or by war and settlement. It is the leaders in Hanoi—not in the United States—who have made the choice. It is up to them—not us—to decide whether to stop their aggression. Their decision will determine the length and intensity of the war. When they realize that aggression does not pay off—that the price of their decision to continue the war is too dear, they will agree to the President's minimal objectives in a settlement—and not before. This need not be any 3, 5, 10, or 20-year war at all; but its length will depend greatly on the President's decision on how much more cost will be paid by North Vietnam and how soon in order to persuade the leaders in Hanoi that continued war is unacceptable to them.

In this connection, a timely lead editorial entitled "We're Talking Too Much," was published in Monday's Washington Evening Star. The editorial points out that all of the talk about negotiations which has been going on from within the United States might be taken as an indication of irresolution on our part. It lays a foundation for the hope in the hearts of the leaders in Hanoi that the United States will not have the patience and perseverance which the President says we shall have to see it through, so that our minimal objectives will be attained and the world will know that aggression does not pay off. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the Des Moines Register of September 5, entitled "Mansfield's

22102

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 7, 1965

Peace Plan," which points out that the majority leader's suggestions "are still far from those offered to date by North Vietnam and its ally, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam—Vietcong."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Sept. 6, 1965]

WE'RE TALKING TOO MUCH

Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, made a speech the other day which was essentially a restatement of our aims in Vietnam. He threw in two additional points, that there must be provision prior to negotiations for a "secure amnesty" and a willingness on all sides to accept a "cease-fire and a standfast." Otherwise, there was nothing new in it.

Since this speech is supposed to have had the prior approval of the President, there is reason to note with some concern Senator MANSFIELD's reiteration of the Johnson statement of July 28: "We insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all of Vietnam under international supervision."

There is all the difference in the world between the free elections in the South and elections throughout all Vietnam. In the former case there would be a right of choice. In the second, there would be none, for such an election would surely be won by the Communists. To agree to any such condition as this would be to capitulate to the Communists, despite all our brave words, and to sell the South Vietnamese down the river. We hope that this was not the essential message that Senator MANSFIELD, with the President's approval, was trying to get across to Hanoi.

It seems to us, furthermore, that the time has come to stop making peace overtures to the Communists every hour on the hour. The fighting has not been going well for them, and they must know that they cannot win this war. Why not let them sweat it out for a while instead of giving them even slight reason to think that we are tiring of the struggle and ready to call it a day?

Senator JAVITS was among those who applauded the MANSFIELD speech. He said we should constantly reiterate our willingness to negotiate, which, in fact, the President has been doing. Then the New York Senator added: "I hope very much that these efforts are not misunderstood as indicating an irresolution on our part."

With this, he put his finger on what may well be the Achilles' heel of our repeated bids for peace. We should stop talking about our willingness to talk, and let our willingness to fight speak for itself for a while.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Sept. 5, 1965]

MANSFIELD'S PEACE PLAN

Two new sets of peace proposals have appeared recently for the Vietnam war: an interview given by South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky including his peace terms; and a speech in the U.S. Senate by Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, ostentatiously approved by the White House, summarizing U.S. terms for peace.

Ky wants time to overcome "many injustices" in South Vietnam before he faces peace negotiations and possible free elections. This doesn't fit in too well with U.S. efforts to get peace as soon as possible, perhaps this fall or winter—but the frank admission of injustices is a new and wholesome attitude for a South Vietnamese to take. South Vietnam can be lost on either the military front or the economic and social front; but it cannot be "won" without solid accomplishments in both.

Ky would like North Vietnamese troops withdrawn from South Vietnam under firm guarantees before he starts peace negotiations, and he wants American troops to stay on until his government asks them to leave. This goes beyond U.S. thinking. But as a hard bargaining position this makes some sense—providing Ky's forces and his U.S. allies win some more victories.

Senator MANSFIELD's speech is much more realistic in the terms it presents. MANSFIELD has been (1) against expanding the Vietnam war; (2) for full debate and full news coverage of it, without fear or favor; (3) for President Johnson's effort to make peace and to hang on in the meantime. In public, MANSFIELD has generally supported administration policy; in private he is said to be critical.

So there is special significance in his appearing this time as administration spokesman, with public congratulations by Vice-President HUBERT HUMPHREY and a White House statement that the speech "reflects the sentiment of the Johnson administration." MANSFIELD himself avowedly based the speech on recent presidential speeches, with "clarifications" of his own.

The Mansfield-Johnson peace terms call for a verified free choice by the South Vietnamese people of their own government and their own destiny, which may be independence of reunion with North Vietnam if they so choose. The terms call also for withdrawal of all foreign forces and bases throughout Vietnam, North and South, once peace is established and adequate international guarantees for noninterference in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are agreed on.

MANSFIELD added suggestions for an amnesty and a ceasefire as essential to negotiations.

These terms are still far from those offered to date by North Vietnam and its ally, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (Vietcong). They want to get the U.S. troops and bases out, but not the North Vietnamese, and they want reunification of Vietnam un-

der elections stacked in favor of the Communists. But they may be doing some rethinking under the impact of the heavy U.S. poundings in the field, and the still heavier U.S. buildup for future hostilities if the war continues.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations, confirmed by the Senate September 7, 1965:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hobart Taylor, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Ralph K. Huitt, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Alexander C. Husband, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Dock in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

U.S. ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

Brig. Gen. Richard Charles Kendall, O1184680, Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Howard Samuel McGee, O387469, Adjutant General's Corps, to be major generals.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Keith Hardie, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

George A. Bukovatz, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years.

Robert Nelson Chaffin, of Wyoming, to be U.S. Attorney for the district of Wyoming for the term of 4 years.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning William L. Atwater, Jr., to be colonel, and ending William J. Zaro, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 23, 1965.

September 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22085

They nearly depleted their financial reserves to modernize the mill and hire expert outside management aid. The president of the company is a white lumberman, Samuel Clements.

As time passed more Indians have moved up to supervisory jobs. Sales have grown each year. The operation is a success and the Menominees are proud of it.

The company also sees income potential in the lease of sites on wooded Menominee lakes to outsiders for summer homes. The objective is a broader tax base. Several leases have been negotiated.

"People still are not happy about all we lost," said Deputy Sheriff Monroe Weso, "but things are beginning to jell now."

"We are doing things," said Ronald Frechette, 31-year-old member of the county board. "In the past the Government always did our thinking."

AIDED FRENCH EXPLORERS

Names such as Frechette and Grignon are common among the largely Roman Catholic Menominees. Members of the tribe met, aided, and intermarried with French explorers who came to their land with Father Nicollet two centuries ago.

Mr. Frechette noted that 37 attractive new frame homes had been built with Federal Home Administration financing. Before termination Indians could not establish credit for such undertakings.

New businesses have been started, including small stores, bars, gasoline stations, a motel, a laundromat. Two families have become building contractors.

The mill is on two shifts and paying union wages. Anyone driving by can see steam shooting skyward 16 hours a day, hear the big saws sing, and watch the yellow tractors scurry about with claws full of logs.

"I have every confidence that we will make it if the bill before Congress passes," said Mr. Dickey. "It could put the county on a sound financial footing for the first time."

"The wishful thinking about turning the clock back to the way we used to live is fading," he went on. "In the large majority of the community now there is definitely a realistic will to do."

L.B.J. OPENS ALL DOORS TO NEGOTIATIONS IN VIETNAM

MR. PROXMIER. Mr. President, there may continue to be teach-ins on Vietnam this fall and winter. Out of this discussion I hope will come some useful ideas as well as the predictable criticism. Academic critics of the administration's policies on Vietnam should be fully aware of the remarkable efforts President Johnson has made to secure negotiations.

Mr. President, I doubt whether there has been a time in history when an American President has gone so far to secure negotiations—to stop the fighting on honorable terms—as has President Johnson with regard to Vietnam.

In a recent column published in the Chicago Sun Times, Roscoe Drummond details just how—as he puts it—no door is closed. All avenues are open.

I ask unanimous consent to have the column written by Mr. Drummond, entitled—"All Doors Open to Viet Talks," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 6, 1965]

ALL DOORS OPEN TO VIET TALKS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—With the help of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD—an Asian expert in his own right—President Johnson has now opened all doors to a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Speaking for the White House as well as for himself, MANSFIELD made it clear that all roads lead to the conference table and that by taking any one of them Hanoi can have peace instead of war.

There are three such roads to negotiation and all are acceptable to the United States:

First. We will go to the conference with or without a cease-fire, with or without a truce. We'll negotiate under either circumstance. Hanoi can choose. We prefer a cease-fire, but don't insist upon it.

Second. We will go to the conference table without any advance commitment as to what either side would accept as a settlement. We would not be committed to the conditions which Hanoi might want. Hanoi would not be committed in any way to the conditions we would want. Namely, "unconditional discussions."

Third. We are also willing to go to the conference table after a careful review of positions on both sides to see whether a basis for agreement is conceivable before formal discussions begin. Namely, conditional discussions, if Hanoi prefers it that way.

No door is closed. All avenues are open. It was this third door on which the Democratic Senate leader rapped the hardest.

MANSFIELD compared the objectives outlined by Mr. Johnson in various speeches and the objectives set out by Hanoi on April 12. He found that on three out of four stated objectives both sides were in substantial agreement:

On the right of the people of South Vietnam to have a government of their own choosing without violence or coercion from any quarter.

On the right of the people of North and South Vietnam, on the basis of a peaceful, free, and verified plebiscite, to decide whether to unite or not to unite the two halves of the country.

On the desirability of having all foreign bases and troops removed from both South and North Vietnam after peace is restored.

Either side might phrase these conditions of peace in different terms, but basically each is saying the same thing. This is why MANSFIELD says he sees a narrowing of the issues and hopes that his effort to narrow the dispute will show Hanoi that there is a basis for early negotiation.

A wide difference does exist on one objective: Hanoi wants the Communist Vietcong to have a decisive or major role in any government in South Vietnam and the government of South Vietnam doesn't want any part of the Vietcong. That's what the war is all about. We're prepared to leave this issue to the verified decision of the people of South Vietnam—if Hanoi is.

The MANSFIELD speech did two other things:

For the United States it closed off the most serious chink in the unity of the Democratic Party in support of the President's military actions in Vietnam. MANSFIELD has been a partial critic and, more recently, a reluctant advocate of the President's course. His latest speech shows that Hanoi might as well give up its hope that disunity within the United States will force the Government to stop defending South Vietnam.

For Hanoi, the MANSFIELD speech might add credibility to Mr. Johnson's repeated willingness to negotiate. The Communists

have been saying that the President's talk of peace was only a cover-up for his desire for war. Not true.

And MANSFIELD, speaking as one who opposed the air raids to the north, makes the peace overtures even more meaningful.

GOOD START FOR HEAD START

MR. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the brickbats continue to fly at the anti-poverty program in spite of an impressive and heartwarming record of accomplishment.

Seldom have we had a domestic program designed to help people escape from the chains of ignorance that bind them to poverty like Operation Head Start. Little children, who otherwise would, in many cases, have faced a lifetime of difficulty, just because schooling and the facilities of our culture were so strange to them, are going to have a real chance. Not just a few such children, Mr. President, but half a million of them.

This program has been a smashing success, one of which all American can be proud.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article analyzing the program published in Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Education: Good Start for Head Start" printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION: GOOD START FOR HEAD START

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The United States last week took a historic step toward the extension of school by at least 2 years, beginning at age 3 or 4 instead of the traditional 5 or 6. This may be the eventual effect of President Johnson's announcement that Project Head Start, introduced this year as a short-term summer program for underprivileged youngsters, will be turned into a permanent part of the educational system.

The Head Start summer project, which ended a week ago, was attended by nearly 560,000 children at 13,400 centers in 2,500 communities. It provided an introduction to group activities, art, music, books, and speaking skills and stressed various aspects of getting ready for school. It offered free lunches and medical checkups.

A preliminary report showed that 70 percent of a large sample of children had their first medical and dental examination during the project. In one center, at Tampa, Fla., 12 tubercular cases were found and 50 youngsters were found to have nutritional deficiencies.

Dr. Vera John, of Yeshiva University, said that visits to 14 centers in New York, South Dakota, and California showed the most striking result to be the involvement of parents from minority groups.

A New York staff member commented on the openness of the project. "Mothers came with baby carriages," she said. She added that, in addition to an official ratio of one professional teacher for every 15 children, there was a huge support force of aids, teenagers, college students, and volunteers.

"How can I go back to my crowded classroom after this?" was a typical question among the teachers in the project.

The original program is a form of educational lifesaving. President Johnson described it as the path of hope for youngsters who had been "on the road to despair." But the extension of preschool education

beyond the summer, as a continuing, all-year operation, is probably the prelude to a change in the school-starting age.

This is not as revolutionary as it sounds. The children of the well-to-do and of many child-oriented, middle-class families already attend private nursery schools, at least from age four. With the children of the poor now also going to school, the majority of middle- and lower middle-class parents will soon expect the same opportunities for their children.

The reasons for the lowering of the school age are not the same for all segments of society. Today children with a comfortable home environment are exposed from infancy to a variety of educational influences. Few educators appreciate the change brought about by television. The around-the-clock impact of words illustrated by pictures is to the old reading and learning "readiness" exercises what a space ship is to the horsedrawn carriage.

NARROWING THE GAP

In addition, today there are more college-trained parents than there were high-school-graduated families at the turn of the century. The result is much conscious or unwitting home-teaching at an early age.

This widens the gap between the affluent majority and the disadvantaged minorities. Head Start was a last-minute effort to help deprived youngsters to make that gap less forbidding. The permanent preschool program, which is already being tested on a small scale by some communities, including New York, and which the President's announcement turned into a regular adjunct to schooling, aims at narrowing the gap systematically before going into formal schooling.

A major element in such instruction would be to give slum children verbal facility and the security that comes from contact with sympathetic adults in a friendly setting. These are prerequisites both for mastery of such academic skills as reading and writing and for the acquisition of social skills which replace aggressive and destructive behavior.

For privileged and underprivileged children alike, much of the preschool experience is an effort to teach self-centered little animals how to function as individuals as well as members of a group.

These considerations were undoubtedly in the minds of the educational experts who persuaded President Johnson to take quick post-Head Start steps. These steps are:

1. To establish all-year centers for disadvantaged children from the age of 3, with an expected enrollment of 360,000 needy children in the coming school year and many more within the next 5 years.

2. To offer summer programs for those who are not included in the year-around centers.

3. To initiate a follow-through program for the Head Start children, including home visits, special tutoring, and a careful observation throughout the first grade. For this purpose, Head Start teachers have prepared reports on every child, to be given to the first grade teacher.

The official enthusiasm over the preschool program is understandable at a time when the social dynamite of the Negro slums must be defused. Faith in education as the great social healer is deeply rooted in the American philosophy. It is a faith proven justified again and again—from the night school for immigrants to the impact of the land-grant colleges.

But many experts, including some who are deeply committed to preschool education, are troubled by potential confusion between humane hopes and excessive claims.

President Johnson said that Head Start, "which began as an experiment, has been battle-tested—and it has been proven worthy." But in the view of many experts the question which has not been "battle-

tested" is how the preschool experience can be so intensified that it will wipe out handicaps of deprivation, not momentarily but permanently. There is already some experimental evidence that children, who have had preschool opportunities, backslide again rapidly in second and third grade unless highly skilled teachers can continue to guide them and their families.

Dr. Bernice Fleiss, early childhood consultant to New York's operation, said: "Many of the children at the beginning of the summer did not know the names of parts of their body—or even their own name. Now, they know not only what their chin is, but who they are. They have an enlarged knowledge of the world around them and the desire to learn more this coming fall."

But this also implies how important it is that the world around these children—in and out of school—be changed so that it will not wipe out short-term gains through long-term futility.

Preschool experts warn privately—they do not want to curb the enthusiasm for the essentially sound movement—that the only way to avert disillusionment, after a head start of hope, is to grasp the magnitude of the task.

They call for more pretesting of children than has been possible in the first, hastily planned round.

More important, they warn that local communities, States, and the Federal Government ought to prepare the public for the extent of the cost in personnel and operations that must be invested if preschooling is to be more than a flash of hope.

For example, New York City had a head start enrollment of about 27,000 this summer. But its year-round preschool experiment had, after 2 years grown only to 7,000. During the summer regular teachers and college students are readily available and school facilities are otherwise largely unused.

Yet many communities have not even begun to provide kindergartens in the regular school structure.

The chronic ills of the schools have largely resulted from large classes. What if head start graduates move into such classes?

Last week, as Head Start's success was hailed, a less enthusiastic report was issued on a related enterprise—"Higher Horizons." Introduced in 1959 in some of New York's slum schools and hailed throughout the country, the enrichment program appears increasingly to have relied on its slogan and publicity value—without the support in funds and staffing that gave it promise as a well-funded pilot project.

"School is a place that families have begun to trust as an institution for the first time," said a consultant to the New York Head Start program last week.

If this implied criticism of the regular school system is justified, then the optimism based on preliminary head start reports will have to be tempered by concern over the total task of education ahead.

VIEWS ON PROGRAM

An official report on Head Start last week included these comments:

A teacher in Kiln, Miss.: "The Negroes and whites are working beautifully together."

From a consultant's report: "There's not too much difference between little Phillip who * * * had to climb a narrow, steep foot-path each day (in New Mexico) and then be driven 25 miles to his first Head Start class and Manuel, the tiny Puerto Rican boy who came to his first class stark naked except for his pencil and notebook."

A parent-coordinator in New York: "We have made more progress in 6 weeks than we have been able to make with parents in 4 years."

RIISING ENROLLMENTS

The U.S. Office of Education predicted last month that school enrollments will set another record. Last week similar projections

were made by the Roman Catholic parochial schools.

Out of a total public and private elementary school attendance of 35,900,000 the parochial schools expect to account for 4,593,000 children, a 1 percent gain over last year.

The Roman Catholic high schools project a 1,124,000 enrollment and a gain of 3.4 percent over the previous year. The Nation's total high school enrollment, public and private, for 1965-66 is set at 12,900,000.

RICKOVER ASKS TEACHERS STAY IN TEACHING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a great breath of fresh air has been blown into American education by Adm. Hyman Rickover, that iconoclastic devotee of education, who has so persuasively deplored the terrible tendency of educators to get lost in the forms, procedures, and mechanics of education, and to forget the basic life of the mind—the great human culture on which our progress is based and on which our future depends.

Ralph McGill recently discussed this Rickover contribution in a recent column. Mr. McGill points to the recent Rickover testimony calling attention to the consequences of Government and industry taking professors out of teaching and into Government or industrial work, which exacerbates an already serious shortage.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. McGill's column, entitled "Young Geniuses Still Need Schools," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 2, 1965]

YOUNG GENIUSES STILL NEED SCHOOLS (By Ralph McGill)

Henry Thoreau entered the following in his journal of January 1, 1853:

"After talking with Uncle Charles the other night about the worthies of the country, Webster and the rest, as usual considering who were geniuses and who not, I showed him up to bed, and when I had got into bed myself, I heard his chamber door open after 11 o'clock, and he called out in a stentorian voice, loud enough to wake the house, 'Henry, Was John Quincy Adams a genius?' 'No, I think not,' was my reply. 'Well, I didn't think he was,' answered he."

Uncle Charles was satisfied, accepting the word of his nephew—whom later generations came to view as at least something of a genius. Time was when the popular concept of a genius was that of a more or less eccentric person who invented something novel, exciting, and useful.

But in our time the broadening of science in our daily life, accelerated and underscored by the marvels of the space age, has enabled us to note that there are many geniuses about. Indeed, a large majority of the students admitted to such an institution as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology may be described accurately as young geniuses.

Demands of science, industry, and the humanities, however, have revealed a need for educational reform in method and curriculum in the elementary and secondary grades. The already serious shortage of teachers is sure to be at a critical point in our colleges and universities by 1970 or sooner.

Adm. Hyman Rickover, an admitted critic of American education, provided testimony at hearings on the Higher Education Act of